

# COURT LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE OF ARIZONA (CLIA)

Judicial Education Center  
541 E. Van Buren Street, Suite B4  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Minutes of the  
May 31, 2013 Committee Meeting

Committee Members Present:	
Kent Batty, Chair	Court Administrator, Superior Court in Pima County
Don Jacobson, Vice Chair	Court Administrator, Flagstaff Municipal Court
Judy Aldrich, Ed. D.	Professor, Chandler/Gilbert Community College
Randolph A. Bartlett	Judge, Superior Court in Mohave County, Division II
Margaret Downie	Judge, Arizona Court of Appeals, Division I
Maria L. Felix	Presiding Judge, Tucson Justice Court
Billie Grobe	Chief Probation Officer, Yavapai County Adult Probation
Sue Hall	Clerk of the Court, Superior Court in Apache County
Phil Hanley	Director of Human Resources/ Administrative Services, Judicial Branch of Arizona in Maricopa County
Michael Malone	Court Administrator, Phoenix Municipal Court
David Sanders	Chief Probation Officer, Pima County Adult Probation
Committee Members Absent:	
Mike Baumstark	Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Court
James Hazel	Presiding Magistrate, Apache Junction City Court
Jolene Hefner	Detention Administrator, Yuma County Juvenile Justice Center
Douglas Rayes	Associate Presiding Judge, Superior Court in Maricopa County
CLIA Staff Present:	
Jeff Schrade	Director, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Gabe Goltz	Program Manager, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Deb King	Special Projects Administrator, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Anthony Cornay	Specialist V, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Harriet Ramsbacher	Administrative Assistant, Arizona Supreme Court, Education Services Division
Guests:	
N/A	

### Call to Order, Administrative Business

Mr. Kent Batty called the meeting to order at 9:33am at the AZ Supreme Court Judicial Education Center in Phoenix, Arizona.

The February 1, 2013, minutes were reviewed and approved as read. *MOTION 2013-02 passed.*

### ESD/Staff Updates:

1) Programs held: Ms. Deb King stated that we are currently soliciting committee recommended court employees to determine their interest in becoming certified faculty for ICM courses with two or less faculty members. The process for certification is for them to first to attend as a participant; the next time to teach one half of the course; and finally to teach the other half of the course the third time it is held. She noted that certified faculty can then teach in any consortium state, not just Arizona.

- Arizona Court Executive (ACE) - Essential Components, May 8-10, Faculty: Marcus Reinkensmeyer and Kip Anderson, 24 attended – rating of 4.70: Ms. King noted that Ron Overholt, Deputy Court Administrator in Pima County, took the first step towards certification in this class.
- Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) - Ethical Considerations for Supervisors, May 16, Faculty: Deb King, 16 attended – rating of 4.75: This is the last webinar to be developed in the ACS program.
- Arizona Court Manager (ACM) - Caseflow Management, May 22-24, Faculty: Louraine Arkfeld, Phil Knox and Amy Wood, 34 attended – rating of 4.78.
- ACM - AZ Plus Specialty Courts, May 24, Faculty: Louraine Arkfeld, 34 attended – rating of 4.59. Ms. King noted that Mike Malone sat in on this class to see if he would be interested in becoming a future faculty member as Judge Arkfeld is the only certified faculty at this time.
- ACS - Supervisor's Role in Caseflow Management, May 29, Faculty: Alexis Allen, Mike Malone and Josh Halversen, 20 attended – rating of 4.45.
- Presiding Judge Leadership Academy, February 27 – March 1 and April 10-12, multiple faculty members. A debrief of the academy will be discussed as a separate topic later in agenda.

### 2) Upcoming Programs

- |  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| • ACE - Education & Training                                       | June 12 -14     |
| • ACS - Ethical Considerations for Supervisors (multiple webinars) | June 6, 18 & 20 |
| • ACM - Financial Resources  | August 7 – 9    |
| • ACS - Transition to Role of Supervisor                           | August 13       |
| • ACS - Human Resources  | September 5     |
| • ACS - Caseflow Management  | September 6     |
| • ACE - Visioning & Strategic Planning                             | Sept. 18 – 20   |

If members need COJET evaluation credits, they are encouraged to consider attending any of these classes.

### *AZ Courts Leadership Pipeline Model:*

Mr. Jeff Schrade reviewed a handout of the AZ Leadership Pipeline model (known informally as the reverse telescope). Mr. Schrade asked the committee to discuss the merits of this model covering the three leadership tiers (ACS, ACM and ACE) as a three-fold tool for retention; for succession planning; and for identifying top talent within the courts. He proposed using this model to promote and encourage enrollment in future programs. The entire process of completing all 3 tiers can take from 6 – 12 years. Candidates with exceptional leadership potential are identified at each level and funneled to the next level, with each level having fewer participants than previous levels. Mr. Schrade noted there are currently 20 candidates from Arizona in the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) Fellowship program as a direct result of CLIA's time and effort. Mr. Batty asked for comments and questions from the committee.

Committee input included:

- Should the timelines be removed from the document? The four year timeline to complete all three levels could be discouraging to potential candidates; although participants can enter into the programs at different levels. Additionally, the long timeline can be detrimental to those in elected positions or the entire top tier of leadership which could depart with the elected official. The timeline is just a suggestion and can be completed in a shorter timeframe. Mr. Malone advised that it took him five years to complete both the ACM and ACE programs, so this tool is a great visual for communicating the timeframe you are committing to. Mr. Goltz advised this tool should be looked at as part of a retention plan – if you have a promising employee start this program, then you have a chance at keeping them employed at least five years or longer. It helps them understand that working for the courts can be a career, not just a job. It was agreed to keep timelines as they indicate the importance of the program and the commitment required to complete it, and are helpful for recipients to understand that this is a retention tool.
- Is the goal of this model to get additional participation in the program? Mr. Schrade responded that the goal is to look at leadership programs as a continuum in terms of succession planning. We need to be thinking of how to encourage the judiciary to identify new talent and get these people into the leadership program at the appropriate level to develop them. The intended audience for the pipeline tool is those at the leadership and management level who are thinking about succession planning.
- Are only current supervisors are eligible for the ACS program? Any existing or aspiring supervisor can apply with the recommendation of their manager. This also applies to the ACM program. ACM participants do not have to be graduates of the ACS program. At the executive level (ACE) the prerequisite is that you have taken, or are taking the ACM program or that you have an advanced degree. However, those who are already in executive management positions can enter directly into the ACE program. It was noted, that if these participants wanted to advance to the NCSC fellowship program, the NCSC would require that they complete their Certified Court Manager program.

- It was suggested that additional, more detailed attachments should be made available along with the tool to give to potential candidates.

### **Marketing Needs:**

Mr. Schrade began this discussion by noting that the Leadership Institute home page ([www.azcourts.gov/CLIA](http://www.azcourts.gov/CLIA)) is filled with more detailed information about the ICM program. There are application forms on-line for potential participants to utilize as well as for managers and leaders to share with their staff. He feels the marketing efforts have been very successful; however, we don't want to stop marketing the program because we need to have a constant influx of new participants at the supervisor level who then go on to enter the ACM and ACE levels. Mr. Batty asked if anyone felt there is a perception of a marketing gap as he does not perceive this to be an issue within his own organization. Mr. Malone said this was actually a point of discussion at the last LJCAA meeting with many people asking about the program; i.e., how to participate and how to become certified as a faculty member, so he believes there is still a gap. Mr. Goltz noted that people continue to ask, "What is this program?" because they want to become involved and to further their careers. Ms. Grobe stated that there is still a lot of turnover, so she feels that we should not stop our marketing efforts.

### **ACS – Participation Overview:**

Mr. Tony Cornay overviewed that the ACS program is a blended approach of face-to-face classes, webinars and online classes. SkillSoft is the vendor that we use for the online content. He then reviewed the handout 'ACS SkillSoft Usage Report' which shows the number of participants increasing. Mr. Cornay is concerned that 60 of 96 original participants have not yet started the online classes and only one person has completed the entire program. He is looking for feedback from the committee on ways to motivate the participants to finish the program in a timely manner. This is a budget issue as well, because the Supreme Court pays to annually renew individual licenses which are not being used. Ms. King noted that a participant cannot attend the Capstone for ACS unless they have completed all of the online classes. However, on a practical level, we still need to know who is actively engaged in intending to complete the program because we plan and schedule classes based on program participation.

### **Inactive Status Proposal:**

Ms. King reviewed a second handout entitled 'Leadership Programs Processes/Policies' noting that staff wants CLIA's buy-in to create an 'inactive status' for those participants who do not complete at least one face-to-face ICM class per year; or in the case of ACS, online classes are not started within 6 months of entering the program and at least 33% of these online classes are not completed each COJET year. If participants have not completed the minimum requirement, they would be notified annually that they are on inactive status and would be asked to complete the minimum requirement in the upcoming year. If during the subsequent year the participant still hasn't completed the minimum requirement, then they would be removed from the program and asked to re-apply if they later wanted to continue the program. Essentially this means is that participants would have to be inactive for two full years before they would have to reapply. Inactive status would enable us to make better scheduling decisions. Member consensus was that this seems to be a reasonable expectation and that the two year timeline seems appropriate.

Ms. Grobe questioned how a supervisor/manager knows how a participant is doing? Ms. King stated that we have completion data for ACM and ACE programs, but that we do not inform management, unless someone asks. At the ACS level, the supervisor/manager should be signing off on each Certificate of Completion sheet as their staff completes a class. Each participant is responsible for tracking their own individual progress. Mr. Batty stated that at least a supervisor should be notified if a participant has gone into 'inactive' status. Ms. King noted we can copy supervisors with inactive status notices.

It was recommended that we add a list of participants completing programs to the Leadership Institute website to acknowledge participant achievement. Ms. King also suggested creating a handout to be distributed at the October Court Leadership Conference congratulating graduates of the programs. The graduation photo is available on our website.

### *Committee on Judicial Education and Training (COJET) Meeting Update Facilitated vs. Non-facilitated Learning*

Mr. Batty briefly went over some points of discussion at the previous day's COJET meeting regarding facilitated vs. non-facilitated learning. COJET's discussion centered on how to define non-facilitated /independent learning and what annual hourly limits would be placed on this type of training. No COJET motion was made to decide on proposed changes; however consensus supported the concept that each employee must have a minimum of 6 hours of facilitated 'live' training within their 16 hour COJET minimum requirement. As for definitions, there was consensus that real-time and interactive training such as WebEx can be considered 'live,' independent of location and place, however, more robotically facilitated training such as SkillSoft classes, would not be included in that definition.

### *Presiding Judge Leadership Academy:*

Mr. Batty initiated the discussion regarding the Presiding Judge Leadership Academy.. Evaluations were very good with Week 2's evaluations coming out slightly better than Week 1. The content appeared to be more valuable to Presiding Judges (PJ's) of up to 10 years. Mr. Batty was pleased with the results of the academy and overall evaluation comments, advising that 85% of the participants said that no significant changes needed to be made to the program. He did question whether or not any structural changes needed to be made to the program; i.e., changing the timeframe from two separate 3 day sessions to (1) five day program. Per Ms. King, the results reflect CLIA and the work groups' commitment and hard work. She also noted that Judge Margaret Downie and Judge Randolph Bartlett provided invaluable assistance. Other comments/suggestions included:

- Include a session with more detail about funding authorities.
- Move some topics to New Judge Orientation for all judges.
- Combine a couple of the sessions as some of them were too broad and had too many learning objectives.
- Reaffirm the length of the program and, if possible, do not hold Friday afternoon sessions.
- Address the needs of single judge courts.
- Should a portion of the program allow judges and court administrators to receive this training at the same time in the same place? Mr. Batty noted that this would be a hard

balance to strike - to have the judges, administrators and clerks in one training, given the widespread territory.

- Who is the target audience? Should we open future training to all judges (including single judge jurisdictions)? For the pilot, invited attendees were from general jurisdiction and large volume limited jurisdiction courts. Judge Downie noted there were several comments indicating it was valuable having mixed general and limited jurisdictions. Mr. Batty wondered if we shouldn't consider having a separate period or discussion group just for superior court PJ's in order to build up camaraderie between the members of this group. Ms. King advised that in Week 1, a random combination of different jurisdictions were seated at each table, while in the Week 2, the tables were limited to the same type of court. Per the evaluation comments, participants liked the week 2 table arrangements better. She believes, however, that there is value in using both types of seating in the future. Mr. Batty noted that it is hard to compare Week 1 and 2 because in Week 1 they are just getting acquainted. It could be feasible, however, to have lunchtime breakout groups for superior court PJ's to meet together
- Judge Bartlett noted that he had spoken with some participants who were very happy with the overall program. Judge Downie thought that while the numbers are lower than we are used to seeing, the overall numbers were higher than she had expected, adding that judges can be a tough audience. Mr. Schrade noted that one dynamic that took place throughout the sessions was the learning amongst the tables. He felt this could open the door to move more towards the New Judge Orientation model of having table mentors at each table. This allows the mentors to have a different role and might attract some of the more experienced and long serving judges. It also acknowledges their experience and allows them to share that experience with newer judges.

Mr. Batty suggested that a sub-committee take a deeper look at the evaluations and attempt to leave some notes for future planners if it is decided to offer this program in 2015 or 2016.

#### *Excellence in Education Awards – Recommendations for 2012 Award Recipients:*

Mr. Batty opened the discussion by asking Ms. King to explain what the two separate handouts represent.

- 1) 2012 Process Review – Candidates on the first handout are broken out by Arizona Court Executive (ACE), Arizona Court Manager (ACM) and Arizona Court Supervisor (ACS) programs. It does not have the 2012 Court Leadership Conference faculty included because the evaluation scores were not high enough to place them among the top candidates. Each line represents a specific class. There are no faculty names listed codes. It was noted that the top two rated classes for ACE were taught by 2011 award recipients. The second group of handouts gave more detail about each of the top candidates including participant evaluation scores and comments, duration of class (1 and ½ hours vs. 2 and ½ days), number of faculty, extra contributions, etc. Ms. King reminded the committee that they can only recommend up to five people to COJET for review. In essence this could work out to only picking faculty from two classes. Ms. Sue Hall questioned whether if a specific class has more than one faculty member, would all of them need to be picked. Ms. King said yes – based evaluations and staff input, the faculty members are pretty evenly matched within the programs.
- 2) Mr. Batty went over the issues to be considered during the deliberations.



- Should there be a minimum threshold score? After review of the packets, it was decided that setting a minimum score was not necessary. As a practical matter only classes with the highest scores were discussed in detail.
  - Should least year's recipients be excluded from consideration? If so, how long should the exclusion last? It was discussed and concluded that previous winners need to be off the list for at least one year. If there is a bad year and no one candidate performs excellently, then there would be no winner for that year. As a result some 2011 recipients who were faculty for a couple of the top-rated 2012 classes were eliminated from consideration.
  - How does the class duration impact the assessment of faculty delivery and performance? Ms. King reiterated that the top four ACS classes were webinars of 1.5 hours in length, as opposed to the ICM programs which are 2 and ½ days. Ms. Hall noted that there is an intrinsic problem comparing shorter classes with longer multiple day classes in that faculty can be much sharper and on point for a short time as opposed to multiple days. It was suggested that in addition to class scores, committee members take into consideration, length of class, participant comments and staff notations of the extra contributions such as curriculum development and program planning.
- 3) Discussion of Candidates – After full review and discussion, the committee nominated the following faculty members for the 2012 Excellence in Education awards: (D) *Kip Anderson and Marcus Reinkensmeyer* for 'ICM - Essential Components' and (E) *Phil Knox, Judge Roxanne Song Ong and Amy Wood* for 'ICM - Caseflow Management.' Ms. King noted that staff will write up the nominations to be submitted to COJET.
- 4) For next year's awards, it might be advisable to include time and contributions spent in planning and curriculum development. Mr. Goltz noted that JCA currently has a sub-committee that discusses the possibility of a lifetime achievement award.

**CLIA Meeting Schedule:** The next meeting is scheduled for September 27, 2013.

**Call to the Public:** None

**Review of Action Items:**

- Ms. King is to submit our Excellence in Education nominations to COJET.
- Convene a de-brief group from the original planners of Presiding Judge Academy.
- Mr. Schrade is to continue to utilize the pipeline tool as an information tool.

**Adjourn:**

The meeting adjourned at 11:59am